

9613400.0992

START

0042887

Author: David R Einan at ~TPA1
Date: 9/27/95 2:14 PM
Priority: Normal
Subject: Re: 300 Area ISV Site

----- Message Contents -----

Jeanne--

I agree. It seems like a good idea. The topic did come up in a meeting with Phil, myself, and DOE and I believe the consensus was the same. My only thought was that to the extent that any of the pre-1988 information is available and could be put into a record somewhere, it would help us not have to redevelop the info.

I will be in my office most of today and Thursday morning, so please call me if you get a chance.

Dave
376-3883

Reply Separator

Subject: 300 Area ISV Site
Author: Jeanne J Wallace at ~TPA1
Date: 9/26/95 11:08 AM

Dave,

I need to talk with you as soon as possible regarding the 300-FF-2 Operable Unit.

Currently I am working on the closure of the In Situ Vittrification Test Facility west of the 300 Area. To date I have no indication that waste has been managed since the unit entered interim status (1988). But there may have been activities conducted at the site prior IS.

I would like to discuss the proposal of including this unit into the workplan for the 300-FF-2 OU. Phil Staats and I discussed the matter and he felt it was a good idea.

Please contact me at your earliest convenience at 736-3019. I will be out of my office most of the day Tuesday, Wednesday and from 12 - 2 pm on Thursday. I do not work Fridays.

Jeanne Wallace



9613400.0993

Author: Jeanne J Wallace at ~TPA1

Date: 1/2/96 10:12 AM

Priority: Normal

Subject: 300 ISV Site

----- Message Contents -----

Dave,

Sorry to hear about your furlough but I hope you enjoy your time off.

I spoke with you some time ago regarding incorporating the 300 Area In-situ Vitrification site into the 300-FF-2 operable unit following procedural closure of the RCRA Part A which covers the ISV site.

I appologize for the delay. It was hoped to have this resolved sometime ago but PNL documentation originally submitted did not present enough data to determine if a release of hazardous waste had occured at the site that would warrent further action.

Jerry Yokel, NWP Chemist, conducted a fairly intensive investigation of documentation associated with activities conducted at the site. Further meetings and requists for information by Jerry resulted in sufficent knowledge of the sites past practices to recommend no further cleanup action. Jerry has compiled a file containing the information used to make his determination. I will provide you with a copy as soon as possible.

Let me know how to assist you in incorporating this site into the 300-FF-2 operable unit. Give me a call when you return at 736-3019.

May the funding by with you,

Jeanne

9615400.0994

Author: Jeanne J Wallace at ~TPA2
Date: 12/5/94 12:19 PM
Priority: Urgent
Subject: Change Requests for December 20, 1994 PMM

----- Message Contents -----

Roger,

RE: PNL Part A Withdrawl Change Request

DOE/PNL submitted change control form, M-20-92-7, which was rejected. DOE/PNL has three interim status TSD's, two of which have milestone due dates for the submittal of Part B's December 31, 1994. These units consist of the thermal treatment unit, M-20-42; the physical/chemical treatment unit, M-20-43; and the biological treatment unit, M-20-44.

By default I have become involved with the three of the PNL Part A, Form 3's. I am the Unit Manager for the 325 Hazardous Waste Treatment unit for which the Physical/Chemical Treatment unit is being combined. Due to lack of RCRA staff it was decided to manage the three as a group.

DOE/PNL were advised to submit the Request for Withdrawl of the three Part A's prior to submitting a change package, allowing adequate time for regulatory investigation and concurrence/denial. DOE chose to submit as a package (November 10, 1994 letter re: M-20-94-03) for which I did not receive my copy until November 28, 1994. It was recommended that the each Part A be addressed by a seperate change request to avoid one of the TSD from compromising the potential for the others to be procedurally closed (325/3100 HWTU UMM 6\7\94).

Recommendations for managing the Part A, Form 3's:

It is appropriate to withdraw the physical/chemical Part A, Form 3. Waste activities which occurred in this unit are being incorporated into the 325 HWTU Part A and B. This unit has been managed in association with the 325 HWTU. The problem is the modified Part A, Form 3, has yet to be received to verify that waste activities are incorporated into the 325 HWTU Part A, Form 3 and may not arrive prior to December 31, 1994.

The thermal treatment and biological unit need thorough investigation to determine appropriate regulatory disposition of the respective Part A, Form 3's.

If Ecology/EPA were to releave these units from interim status and later find they had conducted waste management activities enforcement actions could be pursued.

DOE/PNL will miss two of the December 31, 1994 milestones to submitted Part B's. DOE/PNL are most likely to evoke dispute resolution to allow time for regulatory evaluation of withdrawl request.

Guidance requested regarding TPA coordination?

1. Can a change request be generated and implemented to either delay the December 31 milestones or change the language to reflect the submittal to withdraw?
2. Should Ecology simply allow PNL to miss the milestones.

9413400-0995
3. How am I to proceed with the management of the Part A, Form 3, scope of the Physical/Chemical unit pending the resolution of this issue?

Please contact me at 736-3019 to clarify questions, or to provide any guidance you may have regarding this issue.

Sincerely,

Jeanne Wallace
325 HWTU and Physical/Chemical unit manager
RCRA permit Writer, Kennewick

Wallace, Jeanne

From: Wallace, Jeanne
To: Fujita, Hideo
Subject: RE: Procedural Closure/Part A Withdrawal
Date: Thursday, July 06, 1995 5:59PM

THANK YOU FOR YOUR RESPONSE.

I have not spoken with Jack yet but I have spoken with Dan Duncan (EPA 10) RCRA Hanford Dude. He said he would like to talk with Jack himself.

Dan did not have a problem with no waste activity units procedurally closing. But he did have a problem with certain units which may have conducted treatability studies or sample characterization activities. He said he would research this further before making a decision.

I have not researched this extensively but here is my initial interpretation. Do you think my interpretation is accurate and is it applicable to procedural closures????

Samples undergoing treatability studies are only subject to the requirements of WAC 173-303-050, WAC 173-145, and WAC 173-303-960 if the condition of WAC 173-303-071 (s) (i) through (xiii) are complied with. Samples used for characterization are not subject to the requirements of WAC 173-303 as long as the conditions of WAC 173-303-071 (3) (I) (i) through WAC 173-303-071 (3) (I) (iii) are complied with.

Again any input is appreciated. I will also forward to you the message Tom Cusack forwarded to me from Jerry Lenssen.

THANKS Jeanne 509-736-3019

From: Fujita, Hideo
To: Barraza, Alicia; Maeng, Byung; Yasuda, Dean; Tritt, Galen; Harrover, Robin; Safioles, Sally
Cc: Cusack, Thomas M.; Wallace, Jeanne; Warren, Bob
Subject: FW: Procedural Closure/Part A Withdrawal
Date: Wednesday, July 05, 1995 4:09PM

NWRO HWTU,

If you have time to pass on any tips to Jeanne that I've missed below please do so.

Thanks.

 Jeanne,

I've just returned back in office after a couple weeks off and I'm now trying to go through my eMail.

Procedural closures were a process that was used in HWTRP; however, over the past year, this doorway has closed. History: We were using the "procedural closure process" for situations that you describe below -- essentially protective filers who never utilized interim status conditions. EPA-10 staff no longer supported the quick procedural closure process we were using, that also included regulated units that had stored DW for greater than 90 days (similar to what you outlined below). We were then limited in options and faced with a more formal closure process. Fortunately for NWRO sites, we have managed to complete the procedural closure process for most of these units before the door shut.

I believe that for the situations that are true protective filers (never used interim status conditions, including storage time), a "paper or procedural" closure is the logical and proper mechanism to use. For sites that involve a regulated unit that has exercised interim status conditions, then a case by case situation should apply. I have not re-visited this issue with Jack Boller, our WA Operations contact. I suggest you call Jack and check this out with him (360-753-9428). When you get an opportunity to talk with Jack, I'd appreciate an eMail update note.

Hideo

 From: Cusack, Thomas M.
 To: Davies, David B.; Lenssen, Gerald D.; Rhodes, Janet R.; Werner, Martin D.; Wallace, Jeanne; Fujita, Hideo; Warren, Bob
 Cc: Mosich, Doug; Cusack, Thomas M.; Thomas, Tyrone
 Subject: RE: Procedural Closure/Part A Withdrawal
 Date: Tue, 20 Jun 95 10:59

TO: Jeanne,

first. some documents that may help are found in the HWTR institutional memory compendium. look under the key word "closure". There is a copy of the compendium in the kennwick office.

second. I have sent your request for information to others mentioned above. I think some of them may have had experience with what you are interested in.

TO: HW permit people, Hideo, and Bob.

Can any of you provide any assistance to Jeanne on procedural closures? Her questions are found at the very end of her email below. If you do, can you please included my in on your cc list. thank you all.

 From: Wallace, Jeanne
 To: Mosich, Doug; Cusack, Thomas M.; Thomas, Tyrone
 Cc: Wallace, Jeanne
 Subject: Procedural Closure/Part A Withdrawal
 Date: Monday, June 19, 1995 6:31PM

Hello Gentlemen,

I have been trying to send this message for at least a month now. With other commitments and vacation and all I thought I never get to it. Now it will be quick and dirty because I have to be out of here by 6:30. So we will save formal introductions for later.

My supervisor has tasked me to go forth and determine if procedural closure may be appropriate for some facilities at Hanford. First a little background. Hanford has one EPA id number for most of the site, including those units under consideration. Therefore, I tend to use the term synonymously but I really dealing the units individual Form 3's. The intent is not to revoke the Part A but to basically modify the extent of operation under interim status to reflect actual operations.

Most of the units being considered are research and development facilities who filed for Interim status following the guidance of EPA and Ecology back in the late 1980's in order to circumvent the quantity limitations of an R&D permit. Most of the units have never managed dangerous waste. Some have treated simulant material but not waste.

The TPA (Hanford Tri-Party Agreement) provides some guidance consisting of the following. The TPA, Section 6.3.3, Procedural Closure, states "This is used for those units which were classified as TSD units, but were never actually used to treat, store, or dispose of hazardous waste, including mixed waste, except as provided by 173-303-200 WAC [accumulation standards] or 173-303-802 WAC [permit by rule]. This action requires that Ecology be notified in writing that the unit never handled hazardous wastes. Such information must include a signed certification from the DOE, using wording specified in 173-303-810(13) WAC. Ecology will review the information as appropriate (unusually to include an inspection of the unit) and send a written concurrence or denial to the DOE. If denied, permitting and/or closure action would then proceed, or the dispute resolution process would be invoked".

Guidance has been pursued from the RCRA permitting compendium and the RCRA hotline. Both sources felt procedural closures are a viable option for "protective overfilers". I have spoke with Dan Duncan (EPA) BRIEFLY and he had no problem.

I have been told that someone (?) within Ecology feels this type of closure is no longer available. Could this be possible if 1) there is a consent order in place addressing this very matter, and 2) many of the submittals for Form 3 withdrawal have been sitting in Ecology's lap without action for years?

Anyhow I would appreciate ANY input (contacts, references, historical perspective) to allow me to either

9613400.0998

go forward with processing the Form 3's or denying the request. My number is 736-3019.

Wallace, Jeanne

From: Wallace, Jeanne
To: Yokel, Jerry
Cc: Wallace, Jeanne; Staats, Phillip; Alexander, Steve M.
Subject: 300FF-2/ISV
Date: Monday, October 02, 1995 10:47AM

Jerry,

I hope you remember speaking to me very briefly regarding the incorporation of the Insitu Vitrification site, west of the 300 Area.

I am writing is to request your assistance in reviewing some sampling and analytical data acquired from the site. I would like you to evaluate the information and tell me how far it deviates from standard RCRA closure requirements (methods, levels, constituents, etc.,). The plan is to allow the site TSD to be procedurally closed if dangerous waste contamination is not present from the TSD activities at the site. Other contamination, and perhaps confirmatory sampling, would be addressed through the Past Practice unit remediation.

I would like your review completed by October 31st. Please let me know if you can assist, or direct me to someone who can.

Thank you.

Jeanne

Wallace, Jeanne

From: Russell, Laura
To: Wallace, Jeanne
Cc: Jaraysi, Moses; Moore, Steve
Subject: First 2 Procedural Closures
Date: Friday, October 06, 1995 8:05AM

Jeanne:

Your inspection report summary looks fine to me. I have no additional comments. If you want to finalize it, I will add it to the compliance inspection file.

Laura